

Hazel S, Mortensen K.

[The classroom moral compass - participation, engagement and transgression in language classroom interaction.](#)

Classroom Discourse 2017,

<https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2017.1282881>

Copyright:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Classroom Discourse on 14/03/2017, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19463014.2017.1282881>

Date deposited:

14/03/2017

Embargo release date:

14 September 2018



This work is licensed under a

[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence](#)

The classroom moral compass

Participation, engagement and transgression in classroom interaction

Abstract

This article explores the moral accountability of second language classroom participation, evidenced in sequential environments where participants display an orientation to some or other transgression in the engagement framework. Classroom participation is a sensitive issue which touches on what Garfinkel (1964, 225) has referred to as the *moral order*, constituted through the seen-but-unnoticed practices that pass as the *natural order of things*. A breach in the particular way an engagement framework is organized is treated as transgressive and accountable, and although usually non-critical, it often results in the onward flow of the classroom activity to be momentarily suspended in order to address the transgression. When a classroom participant violates this 'normality', it not only attracts attention but can even invite moral and psychological evaluations, and may threaten the social status of the member responsible. Participants manage the tension for adhering to certain (negative) social categories by adopting mitigating strategies, for example by occasioning a jocular frame when attending to the transgression. Drawing attention to potentially sensitive issues points at the underlying moral order and at what is handled as normal, which in turn provides the analyst with a window on the practices into which participants have been socialized.

Keywords

L2 classroom organization; participation; moral order; classroom tasks; Conversation Analysis

1. Introduction

The conjoint organization of the language classroom has continued to be an important line of scholarship since McHoul (1978) adopted Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson's (1974) work on turn-taking practices in ordinary conversation, and applied it to the world of the classroom (see e.g., Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Mori, 2004; Seedhouse, 2004). The work builds on two general assumptions: that 'active', vocal participation in class benefits the language learner, and that the ways in which teachers organize classroom activities can both promote and constrain student participation (e.g., Walsh, 2006). Paoletti and Fele (2004) have spoken of this as teachers' (pedagogical) challenge: they are tasked with managing both the turn-taking and 'order' in the classroom. What is more, such orderliness is dynamic rather than static. For instance, turn-taking practices change with shifts in pedagogical focus, reflexively organized by the members in class (Seedhouse, 2004). Finally, the pedagogical setting of the language class takes on many shapes and

forms, from large group lecture halls to café-situated one-to-ones, as reported in a growing number of studies (Hauser, 2009; Hellermann & Pekarek Doehler, 2010; Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004; Mortensen, 2008b; Mortensen & Hazel, 2011; Pekarek Doehler & Pochon-Berger, 2015; Sert, 2015). In addition to the role of verbal and vocal conduct in classroom organization, several studies have documented that visual resources, such as gaze, gesture and body posture, as well as material artefacts constitute relevant resources in the contingent operation of organizing turn-taking (Kääntä, 2010; Mori & Hasegawa, 2009; Mortensen, 2009; Mortensen & Hazel, 2011; Pitsch, 2006; Sahlström, 1999).

This paper adds to the description of classroom interaction by focusing on the moral accountability of language classroom participation. The focus of our analysis is sequential environments where participants display an orientation to some or other transgression in the proposed moral order of the classroom, here in cases of turn-allocation, language choice and personal boundaries. The aim of the paper is not to describe these practices *per se*, but to consider cases where classroom participants deal with participatory acts as moral-implicative transgressions. In our data, such instances feature frequently, and here we include exemplar cases where participants orient to different ‘types’ of moral order being violated, treated by participants as significant-enough to launch a side sequence (Jefferson, 1972) in which a transgression and its account are topicalized.

Although data for the current article are drawn from language classrooms, we are not claiming that these phenomena are intrinsic to participation in language classroom interaction *per se*. Even where the analysis deals with instances where linguistic issues are at play, it does not preclude other kinds of classroom settings where content-engagement and classroom participation are also subject to underlying social agreement between members. Indeed, rather than claim that there is a generalized set of rules for language classroom engagement, we show how these may change even within the course of a class, across individual tasks and activities, and depending on the teaching methodology of the teacher.

a. Moral order in interaction

A recent spate of edited collections of empirical studies of morality, moral order and its interactional constitution (Bergmann, 1998; Cromdal & Tholander, 2012; Stivers, Mondada, & Steensig, 2011) evidences one strand of what has been described as ‘the social turn’ in the study of language and human sociality. Here, phenomena that have previously been described in abstract terms or as

internal cognitive states are investigated as being constituted in interaction between members, and as such describable as social phenomena. In these lines of study, morality is treated as people doing the 'right' thing, here understood as not acting out of the ordinary (Sacks, 1984). Morality from this perspective does not set out universal principles of right and wrong and the human condition, but is defined within specific social groups (cf. Goffman, 1961, 1963) and observed in social practices as seen-but-unnoticed members' conduct.

Such interactional approaches to the study of morality build on Ethnomethodology (EM), which approaches moral order as that which underpins the practical accomplishment of ordinary, routine courses of social life. According to EM (and later to Conversation Analysis (CA) as well), this is the basis for human sense-making. The problem for the analyst is that the moral order transcends all aspects of our social life making it invisible for ordinary members of society. Garfinkel thus talks about the moral order being 'seen but unnoticed', only surfacing once it is 'absent' or violated in some way:

'[a] society's members encounter and know the moral order as perceivedly normal courses of action – familiar scenes of everyday affairs, the world of daily life known in common with others and with others taken for granted.' (1964, 225)

Breaches in this 'normality' attract attention, as they rupture the expected courses of actions through which activities are ordinarily organized, and this may have negative (social) consequences for the parties responsible. That is, people are assumed to comply with the moral orderliness of social events (Schutz, 1967) and are held accountable for any transgressions from it. For this reason, Garfinkel's own (initial) way of grasping the moral order was by violating it through so-called breaching experiments. Later, EM turned toward more ethnographic approaches in order to describe the underlying moral order of practical courses of action (e.g., Liberman, 2013; Turner, 1974). Building on this line of research, Sacks (1992) became interested in how moral order is visible through participants' orderly production of sense-making in interaction. CA studies are thus interested in revealing and describing just what moral order consists of.

Bergmann (1998) outlines two main strands that frame scholarship on morality and interaction. The one is concerned with investigating members' accounts of moral conduct and of how societal members are implicated as moral or immoral actors. These studies seek to address how moral evaluative accounts are worked up in interaction (Aronsson & Cederborg, 2012; Potter & Hepburn,

2012; Stokoe & Edwards, 2012), with the research impetus to explicate the moral reasoning underlying such person descriptions and the work of producing them. The other research perspective aims to describe the moral order of interaction itself. These studies foreground how members treat local interactional conduct as orderly and accountable, with transgressions from the ‘present but unnoticed organizing properties of talk and action’ (Jayyusi, 1991: 242) treated as diverging from some local moral orderliness. In this work, deviations from normative social agreement pertaining to how sociality should be conducted is treated as moral transgression, and can therefore be subject to some form of reprimand (Niemi, 2016; Niemi & Bateman, 2015). For example, in cases where a student – or indeed a teacher – has failed to prepare adequately for a class, as in this extract below, we note in the finely interwoven tapestry of glances and looks, smiles and gesticulation, and verbally explicit calls to account, how a breach in what is treated as a social contract is consequential to both the local order and the moral standing of a member in the class. In the sequence, the three students (Sabine, Camilla and André) of an English as a foreign language (EFL) adult class are taking turns at reading out items from a homework task. As the excerpt begins, Sabine provides a candidate answer to the teacher’s prior elicitation, but this is treated as dealing with the wrong task item.

Excerpt 1

[FIGURE 1 INSERT HERE]

The example shows the compact interactional work that is found in such public reprimand sequences. Initially Sabine shows reluctance to owning up to the breaking of this unwritten contract between the members, where there is shared agreement that students complete homework tasks set by the teacher. Her answer is very delayed (line 11). Rather, she withdraws gaze from the teacher, glances down at the textbook before establishing mutual gaze with her fellow student and laughing. This would constitute an invitation to collaborative laughter, but with Camilla’s laughter not forthcoming, Sabine returns her gaze to the textbook. It is not until the teacher pursues a response, first with a repair initiator ‘huh?’ (line 8), and when this still does not prompt an answer with a subsequent candidate answer ‘no’ (line 10), that Sabine finally concedes that she did not do her homework. However, we note that this minimal response is treated as inadequate. The teacher follows it with a request for an account for not having done the homework (line 12). With Sabine failing to give one, stating that she does not know (line 14), the teacher categorizes her as being ‘not a good student’ (line 16), in the process categorizing the others as good students, or classroom members whose preparations avoid disrupting the onward flow of the classroom activities.

We see that appearing to breach the local orderliness of interaction can have negative consequences for members and their moral standing within their peer groups, or may indeed lead to peer-exclusion or categorization as out-group member (see Niemi & Bateman, 2015). In the above example we note how André and Camilla monitor the public chastisement of Sabine, albeit with Camilla averting her gaze when the teacher admonishes Sabine as ‘not a good student’. Indeed, it is their presence that makes this a public admonishment as well as implicating them as vicariously the injured parties, those whose classroom participation is being disrupted. In order to manage these consequences, Bergmann (1998, 288) posits that ‘moral activities frequently are mitigated, covered, and neutralized or are positioned within a nonserious humorous or ironic frame’, and we note above how the sequence is also characterized by smiling conduct between all members, as well as the somewhat demonstrative pantomime finger wagging of the teacher (line 16).

The jocular attitude employed by the teacher in the above excerpt may point to the delicate nature of the reprimand, with adults holding one another to account for their social conduct. Addressing an issue with humour may be a way to normalize the breach in the social contract between members. For instance, Garfinkel (1967) noted that when you question the seeming commonsense of everyday life, co-participants typically try to normalize the situation, thus treating the breaching participant as a competent member of society who must have ‘good reasons’ for the breach. In addition, this is a private language classroom, and the delicacy through which the teacher must navigate these sequences may be further compounded by the service transaction nature of the setting. Students here are paying a language school in order to attend this class. As such, the students are the teacher’s customers, with whatever implications this may hold for the institutional role-relationship between the participants.

The above example shows a violation of a norm for classroom participation that is reaffirmed verbally each time a teacher instructs students to do homework. Not all such agreement is discussed so explicitly. Classroom participation – both that of students and of teachers - is subject to local registers of orderliness that are worked up and managed *in situ*, the rules of which may change from school to school or classroom to classroom, or indeed between activities within the same class. Hence, how members index potentially sensitive issues provides us with a window on the underlying moral order and the practices into which participants become socialized.

II. Background to the study

This article forms one part of a wider study of the social life of the language classroom (Hazel & Mortensen, in revision; Mortensen, 2009, 2016), and more narrowly related to language classroom moral conduct, as touched upon in Hazel & Wagner (2015) and Mortensen & Hazel (forthc.). These investigations have sought to add to scholarship that has continued to bring further understanding of the complexities that go to make up the locally constituted practices of classroom interaction. We are interested in members' work as it is carried out as socio-interactional contingencies within micro-moments of classroom conduct, that is with the participants' work of constituting the institution of the classroom through their conjoint actions. The method by which we do this is ethnomethodologically-grounded video analysis, drawing on traditions developed in Conversation Analysis (e.g., Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974). Video recordings afford researchers rich opportunities for subjecting naturally occasioned classroom interaction to fine-grained scrutiny. As a consequence, these studies are able to explicate the 'seen-but-unnoticed' practices, including those that are produced through verbal, vocal, visual, graphic and material means, through which members constitute the local structural properties of local pedagogical settings. It is these 'expected background features of everyday scenes' (Garfinkel, 1964, 226), treated by members as 'natural facts of life' (ibid. p225), that this work is geared to describing.

The first analysis features data recorded in a Luxembourg L2 English classroom, recorded over a period of 6 months. The class recorded here was small, consisting of 3 students and a teacher, with the class aimed at lower proficiency students¹. Second, data are also drawn from the CALPIU² data storehouse, a large depository of audio-visual data recorded in Denmark. The sub-set of university-situated Danish L2 classrooms recordings presented here relates to a combined Module 2/3 of the Danish Education 3 graded-progression³. Four weeks of twice-weekly classes were recorded for this sub-set.

Both data sets were produced using 3 stationary cameras in order to maximize coverage of the classroom. In the Danish data, additional table-top microphones were placed on each table in order to optimize the quality of the audio component. Data were transcribed in CLAN, with illustrative cases selected for presentation here. Transcription conventions are based on those developed by Gail Jefferson (e.g., 2004). Some are used here in modified form for the benefit of the CLAN software tool (conventions provided at the end of the text). The resulting data representations were

¹ This is equivalent to Breakthrough (A1) level of The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)

² Research Center for Cultural and Linguistic Practices in the Internationalized University, Roskilde, Denmark.

³ This correspond to the Waystage/Waystage-Threshold (A2) on the CEFR scale

subsequently analysed using methodological practices developed in the field of Conversation Analysis (Sacks et al., 1974).

3. Analysis

In the following section, we present a number of cases where we observe classroom participants orienting to some or other form of transgression, breaching the normal, local courses of classroom conduct. For this article, we have looked at four different types of transgression, relating to speaker selection, language choice, task engagement, and personal boundaries.

3.1 *Stepping on others' turns*

Language classroom pedagogical activities typically involve teachers eliciting certain task elements while managing turn-allocation. This may be locally negotiated, that is in how students either self-select or indicate their willingness to be selected by the teacher (Mortensen, 2009; Sahlström, 2002); or by a teacher taking responsibility for allocating turns and selecting next-speakers (Mortensen, 2008b). Alternatively, the organization of student contributions may evidence some pre-allocation, for example through an orientation to some 'external' organizational structure such as seating arrangements and text-book tasks (Mortensen & Hazel, 2011)¹. Where teachers take it on themselves to allocate turns to students, 'the right and obligation to speak is given to a single student; no others have such right or obligation' (McHoul, 1978: 188). Where another student goes against this form of classroom organization by 'speaking out of turn', this can be treated as a transgression of the classroom order.

In the following excerpt, the participants are managing a pedagogical activity centered on a grid of pictures contained within a handout, with the students each in turn required to produce a sentence that described the activity depicted. Turn allocation is organized as a round robin (Mortensen & Hazel, 2011). The sequence starts with the teacher accepting a contribution by Camilla, and allocating the next turn to André, who at this point is already orienting to this by leaning over the handout and positioning his pen above the next-in-line picture.

Excerpt 2

[FIGURE 2 INSERT HERE]

Following the elicitation by the teacher, André does not produce the task completion immediately. After the rather lengthy pause, he produces an extended audible in-breath and subsequent breath exhalation. At this point, we see that it is Camilla who produces a candidate formulation (lines 8), ‘he plays’. With no uptake forthcoming from the teacher in next position, Camilla self-selects again and produces what can be heard as an increment, adding ‘the’ in low volume (line 10), which projects a subsequent object, while at the same time retroactively turning the verb ‘play’ from its intransitive to transitive form. This suggests her understanding of the lack of teacher response as stemming from her not having fulfilled the requirements for the task, i.e. producing a sentence that describes the picture. However, she is prevented from completing the sentence by the teacher. In line 12, the teacher gazes at Camilla, frowns and responds to her contribution with the turn formatted as a question: ‘is your name André?’ while leaning towards Camilla, smiling and producing a single handclap. We see that Camilla does not treat this as a question (for another example of this, see Mortensen & Hazel, *forthc.*). Indeed, the teacher knows the three students’ names, and furthermore the male gender of the name does not correspond to the female student in any way. Rather than respond with an answer, she responds with a number of embodied actions and an explicit apology, ‘sorry’ (line 14). She appears then to be treating the teacher’s interjection as an admonishment.

Closer inspection of how this admonishment is acknowledged reveals densely-packed, intricate interactional work occasioned between the participants. First, we note that Camilla’s acknowledgment is initiated very early in the teacher’s turn. Indeed its onset is almost immediately following the turn-initial-placed ‘is’ in the question (line 12). We note that the teacher formats the turn by adopting a higher-pitch than his previous talk, and it is possible that this acts as a cue that the ongoing activity is being suspended. Camilla momentarily opens her mouth, only to close it again in a lip-pursing gesture, while bringing her hand up to cover her mouth with her fingers. The combined gesture could be read as Camilla withdrawing her claim to the slot, by visibly suspending the completion of the initiated formulation. Moreover, the teacher’s choice of words does not constitute an explicit admonishment, but formatted in such a way as to leave it to Camilla to infer what the admonishment is for. Once she starts producing her dumbshow response, the teacher supplements the unfolding turn with a smile and a subsequent, somewhat theatrical handclap. Camilla then closes her eyes, visibly compressing the eyelids, and thereby demonstrably breaking

off from mutual gaze with the teacher. Producing the apology, 'sorry', Camilla smiles and she and Sabine glance at one another, briefly establishing mutual gaze and an exchange of smiles. The teacher returns the slot to André, and Camilla and Sabine face forward again, as the activity proceeds.

We see that where students self-select at points where a teacher has allocated a next turn to another party, this may be worked up between the participants as a breach of the classroom order. By temporarily suspending the forward flow of the classroom activity, the teacher contravenes what has been described elsewhere as a preference for progressivity (Heritage, 2007; Schegloff, 1992; Stivers & Robinson, 2006). It is in the absence of the teacher producing any accounting for this himself, where it is open to the members to interpret what or who is responsible for this suspension. Here it is the 'offending' student Camilla, she who spoke 'out of turn', who appears to take responsibility. In doing so, she displays her understanding of the teacher's 'is your name André?' as indexing her contribution as being a violation of turn-allocation.

By not articulating the transgression in any explicit way, the teacher obliges the student(s) to analyse what might have happened to warrant the suspension. Implicitly, this acts 'to claim that a violation has occurred, but also that the target knows it and is accountable in a very strong way for its occurrence' (Goodwin, 2006: 43-44). Meanwhile, by triggering the interceding sequence in this way, the teacher allows for it to be treated as non-critical. We note how the sanction itself is treated as a laughable by all parties. This here appears to function along the lines of what has been described as 'incongruity theory' in humour research, where laughter is brought about through a 'divergence between an expected and an actual state of affairs' (Deckers & Kizer, 1975: 215). As mentioned previously, the teacher asking Camilla 'is your name André?' sets up situational dissonance between what the others know the teacher knows (Camilla's name) and his asking her the question, compounded with the name itself being a masculine name that does not correlate with her gender. In addition, the teacher produces a broad smile, which he maintains throughout Camilla's multi-part response.

That the teacher formats his sanctioning of the student as relating to a non-critical transgression may point to his indexing of the student's offense as being non-intentioned. The students' change of state tokens that follow the teacher's admonishment appear to confirm this reading. But they may also point to some seepage between different kinds of order – that of the classroom and that of the everyday life. In ordinary conversation it may well be acceptable to provide candidate answers 'out of turn', but this may not be appropriate in certain pedagogical activities in the classroom. The

change of state tokens may then index students' analysis of their transgressive acts as resulting from other normative interactional practices, rather than this one, the orderly production of the *pedagogical task accomplishment*. Misreading the local order can be seen to lead to members being publicly brought back into the fold, although with others mitigating for the accepted embarrassment that this causes through how they downplay the seriousness of the breach. However, the fact that they are treated as significant enough to derail the forward progression of a classroom activity points, however, to such breaches being treated as far from inconsequential.

As we have seen in this section, turn allocation in language classroom interaction is one order to which members must remain sensitive. Appropriate turn allocation practices are part and parcel of what makes a language classroom exactly that. At the same time, what a speaker does with the turn when one has been allocated is another member's concern. We see this, for example, even at the level of language choice, as described in the next section.

3.2 Straying across language boundaries

Second language classrooms differ from those in other subjects in that the content to be acquired is often also the medium through which the class is conducted. In cases where the only shared linguistic set of resources between students is the target language, for example English in ESL classrooms populated by members from different parts of the world, the members are forced to use the language to communicate between one another. In a L2 class populated by members who share another language, on the other hand, participants may choose to draw on this language too (e.g., Hazel & Wagner, 2015). The pedagogical idea of 'one classroom, one (foreign/second) language' is a prevalent one in L2 classroom literature. It is important to acknowledge, however, that within a single class, this may fluctuate between activity stages. For example, in a sequence from the same Luxembourg EFL classroom discussed above, a student uses French without this being challenged.

Excerpt 3

[FIGURE 3 INSERT HERE]

In this sequence, from an activity in which the teacher is asking the students for accounts relating to their jobs, Sabine's use of French (lines 14-15) is not treated as overstepping the rules of language choice. Rather, the teacher uses her French talk to identify linguistic forms that she has difficulties with, and which he can address. The use of additional linguistic resources other than the target

language may, however, be treated as a break from the moral order of the classroom and may draw a rebuke from the teacher. In a different sequence from the same classroom, we may see something like the following. Here, André is asked by the teacher to explain to fellow student Camilla what lonely means:

Excerpt 4

[FIGURE 4 INSERT HERE]

In contrast to the sequence in excerpt 3, André's question regarding language choice for carrying out a word explanation task causes him to become the brunt of ridicule, albeit within what is formatted as a jocular frame. In response to the teacher's display question in line 1, André does not provide an answer, but rather initiates an insertion sequence, asking whether his response should be in English (lines 3 and 6). Rather than provide a straight answer to this, the teacher embellishes it. With a high-pitched 'smiley' voice, he first starts repeating André's question back to him, before cutting this off mid-word to produce a second pair-part, 'of course in English' (line 7), which treats André's question as common-sense – something he should have known. Although this in itself could bring the insertion sequence to completion, the teacher holds the turn and proceeds to give an account for his ruling, with 'it's an English class' (line 8). This is of course not news to the students and therefore an incongruous message, and they respond to it with smiling and laughter. In response, the teacher suggests that André explains it in Luxembourgish, a language that Camilla does not share⁴, lending further weight to the jocular framing of the teacher's instruction.

Even simply suggesting the use of a language other than that of the instruction may, then, be treated explicitly as a transgression of the classroom order, and he or she proposing this deviation may be subject to censure. However, as we see in the above examples, such rules are not adopted as universally relevant regulations, but rather are bound up with the particular local sequential environment, for example in undertaking a particular task in the target language. Classroom tasks operate, of course, with their own internal logic, and it is here that we see another register of order to which members must adhere.

3.3 Task engagement, task management

One place in language classroom organization where we see rules of engagement often expressly

⁴ This claim is based on ethnographic background data

articulated is in task-related activities. Here, language teachers, or at times language classroom teaching and learning materials (Hazel & Mortensen, in revision), provide the students with some pre-formulated exercise, proposed to address some or other pedagogical concern. These may for example provide students with opportunities to practice their speaking skills, to collaboratively engage in problem-solving, or to complete a writing project. For the students to successfully complete the task, they must understand what is being required of them, and they must follow what rules are introduced to govern the carrying out of the task. For example, there may be a rule banning the use of online dictionaries to accomplish a writing task, or a rule stipulating that the target language alone must be used in collaborating with one's classmates, or both and more. The rules of conduct thereby constrain how students go about completing the task, by presenting them with procedural frameworks to which they are required to adhere. A flouting of these rules, or an inability to keep to them, may lead to displays of trouble in proceeding, and at worst to the public sanctioning of a student.

In what follows, we observe how certain elements in a task that has been set by a teacher cause students some trouble, with rule-breaking treated as a breach in the 'perceivedly normal courses of action' (Garfinkel, 1964, p225) relating to the task engagement.

In a low intermediate Danish as a second language classroom at a university in Denmark, the teacher (TEA) embarks on a task, where students are instructed to make short presentations to the class.

Excerpt 5 CALPIU-M23

[FIGURE 5 INSERT HERE]

Initiating the activity, the teacher models a short presentation about himself. Turning to the blackboard where he has written a list of activities that represents the lesson plan for the day, he points to the item 'Præsentation' (Eng. 'presentation'), verbalizes it (line 22), and clarifies that it should be 'really short'. Although he subsequently launches into his own presentation of self (lines 26-30), he suspends this almost immediately to provide a further clarification of the task instructions (line 32-33), that he will model a presentation, and that he wants the students subsequently to do the same. Following one student's acknowledgement (line 34), the teacher repeats the second item in the list of personal information (line 35), and continues with the modelling of the presentation.

In what follows, the teacher provides a short description of his life, including in the list of personal

details his name, country of origin, age, length of stay in Denmark, occupation, relationship status and nationality of spouse, and number of children. The presentation is done in Danish, modelling the language constructions in the target language. At the end of the presentation section, he briefly code switches to English (line 64), which may act as a form of boundary marker, signalling the end of the modelling sequence.

Excerpt 6 CALPIU-M23 continued

[FIGURE 6 INSERT HERE]

Returning to Danish (line 65), he reinforces the transition by commenting on what his presentation contained, assessing it as sufficient. He signals a passing of the baton to a student with the Danish 'værsgo' ('there you go'), which is treated by the student as a cue. She rises from her chair, and proceeds to give a similar presentation (from line 75), covering the same personal details as the teacher had done previously. This presentation proceeds initially without hitch, and the only contributions the teacher makes are in the form of continuers and acknowledgement tokens. When she arrives at saying something about her occupation, however, we see what is treated as a breach of the activity rules.

Excerpt 7 CALPIU-M23 continued

[FIGURE 7 INSERT HERE]

International students attending Danish universities are often enrolled in English medium programmes, and the institutional names for the programmes, modules and administrative procedures are therefore also in English. Here, we note how this causes the student some trouble in naming it in Danish. In line 91, she describes herself as 'student', pronounced as the English word, follows this with the preposition in Danish, but then formulates her status and topic of study in English (line 91). In next position, the teacher produces what could be taken to be another continuer (line 93), but rather than proceed with the task, the student responds with what is either a Danish 'ja' (yes) or English 'yeah', formatted with rising intonation. This minimal response poses a conundrum for the teacher, as it is left open what is being asked of him here. He is unable to confirm the veracity of the student's statement, and indeed she would be afforded superior epistemic rights to pronounce on her own personal details (Sacks, 1984). The 'ja↗' could alternatively be a task completion check,

seeking acknowledgement that she has done enough for the task to be evaluated as sufficient.

What the teacher ultimately does is treat the student's turn as a request for assistance in locating the Danish equivalent terms for her studies. He directs his gaze to the wider group of students, and asks in Danish 'what it's called' (line 97). It is ST5 who responds however. She produces a designedly incomplete utterance (Koshik, 2002), producing the first component ('natur') of the Danish term for 'natural sciences', 'naturvidenskab', formatting it with continuing intonation and with the turn-final phoneme stretched. That it is she who self-selects to do this may point to her orienting to her not only having superior epistemic *rights* to describe her own life world, but also an obligation to be able to speak about one's own personal circumstances. There is a conflict at play here. Although she has flagged up difficulties in setting out her situation in Danish, it is still she who is expected to be able to do so.

In line 100, the teacher provides the student with a candidate answer. However, rather than giving the name for the study area, 'naturvidenskab', he names the programme for the natural sciences bachelor degree, the abbreviated 'Nat Bas'. Formatted with rising intonation, the student is invited to confirm the candidate, which we see her do initially in the next position, although she subsequently repairs this to 'Nib Bas', the international version of the programme offered in English at the university. The segment is followed by a short sequence where the teacher and student speak of the different acronyms of the study programmes, before the student proceeds with the initial task, here offering her relationship status as 'single', which the teacher points accepts as an English loanword in Danish.

Excerpt 8 CALPIU-M23 continued

[FIGURE 8 INSERT HERE]

In sum, there is an orientation to a transgression being made in line 91, one which disrupts the forward flow of the task by the student, and one that needs to be addressed, indeed repaired. At the same time, although the transgression is treated as one of language choice, naming the student's study programme in English rather than being able to do it in Danish, the eventual repair is not done by naming the study area, 'natural sciences' or 'naturvidenskab' in Danish, but the study programme 'Nat Bas' or 'Nib Bas', which are not of course, Danish terms. We also note that there is a conflicting moral imperative at play here, where the speaker has superior epistemic rights and also obligations to describe his or her own life world, as has been described in CA studies elsewhere

(Heritage & Raymond, 2005; Sacks, 1984). This last point is also relevant for what follows, as we turn our attention to a later section in the same activity. Here, however, we see that it is the teacher - rather than the students - who appears to need to account for his choice of activity.

3.4 Infringing on private matters, in a public arena

We noted in the previous example how the student participants may be called on to give personal details as part and parcel of the carrying out of a task. In that example, we also noted that the student has both the epistemic authority to pronounce on their own personal affairs, but that they may also be obliged to take responsibility for providing those accounts. In this section, we focus on another implication of this, namely the fine balance between engaging students in tasks that draw on their real life-worlds located outside the classroom, and requiring students to disclose to others potentially sensitive aspects of their lives.

Following ST5's task completion, the turn to present is passed to ST1, who herself embarks on listing the same personal details. Similarly to the previous example, the English name of the study programme that she is attached to leads to a side sequence where the Danish equivalent is discussed. This time, however, once this has been resolved, the student does not immediately resume with the task, and the teacher this time formulates a prompt to do so.

Excerpt 9 CALPIU-M23 continued

[FIGURE 9 INSERT HERE]

The teacher and student round off the embedded discussion on the name for the study programme, 'global studies', much like the discussion detailed in the previous section (line 216-218). At this point, whereas ST5 proceeded earlier with the task by moving on to her relationship status, on this occasion we note that ST1 holds off from resuming the task accomplishment. Instead, following a 1.0 second pause, TEA self-selects and, staying in English, produces the first component of a turn construction unit, 'are:' (line 220), which may project the onset of a question being formulated. He suspends the turn, leaving the TCU hanging over a 1.1 pause, before producing a lengthened hesitation maker, 'uh:::'. The verb form 'are' here constrains the possible trajectories that the question would normatively be able to take. It suggests a polar question, while excluding both singular 1st and 3rd person referents. From the list of items included in the task, only that pertaining to civil or relationship status may be possible here, and sequentially this would fit the model presented by the teacher initially and copied by the first student (ST5). However, there is no uptake

from the on-task student.

At this point, one of the other students (ST2) formulates a question, ‘how old are you’ in Danish (line 221). She does this in low volume, which may evidence an orientation to a procedural transgression in its own right. As the task has been set by the teacher for the respective students, and as the teacher has not specified who the presentation is for, the general organization of the activity proceeds with the teacher as the designated recipient. Indeed, it is the teacher alone who provides the prompts, produces continuers and acknowledgement tokens during the presentations. The other attendant students are only allocated turns to contribute when directed to do by the teacher. With ST2 here providing a prompt, this would appear to be a breach of the overall organization of the activity. As such, formatting it with reduced volume may act as an acknowledgement of a role-transgression, and mitigating for the infraction.

As it is, neither the student nor the teacher acknowledge the contribution, and the teacher instead pursues the same information that followed the series of items in the list that he initially outlined in his modelling of the presentation, and paralleled by ST5. Following another pause, he asks in Danish, ‘are you single or are you married’ (line 223). The student responds at the possible turn relevant position point at the end of the first component of the question (‘er du single’), confirming that she is single. The TEA restates this immediately after finishing the full polar question, ‘you are also single↘’, and this is confirmed again by ST1 in next position (line 225), which in turn is acknowledged by the teacher.

It would appear that at this juncture the task item has been addressed and that the presentation could move on to the next item in the task list. However, what happens is that the teacher himself takes the floor to give an account for the inclusion of this item in the task.

Excerpt 10 CALPIU-M23 continued

[FIGURE 10 INSERT HERE]

We see in this segment how the teacher sets out his reasons for including the eliciting of information about the relationship status of the respective students in the task. Although it is not uncommon to provide an account for why students are required to perform particular tasks, the reasons here appear at one step remove from the task accomplishment. Whereas the main reason behind this task may be to practice speaking about oneself, with a secondary reason perhaps also to allow the different

students to get to know their classmates better, the account provided here for the inclusion of this item relates to whether the students are in relationships with Danish speakers (line 231), and therefore have access to Danish speaking opportunities in their private lives (line 233). As such, this is more closely targeted at a student's personal circumstances.

A person's relationship status, whether he or she is single, married, divorced, widowed, childless, orphaned, adopted, jilted, a spinster and so on and so forth, has from time immemorial being treated as socially and morally implicated in a person's identity and social standing in the community (e.g., Beattie, 2007). The strength of such membership categorizations (e.g., Sacks, 1992; Stokoe, 2003) varies from place to place, social-economic background, and may shift radically from one period to the next. Within a classroom such as the one included in the data, with student participants drawn from around the world, a whole range of understandings of such social categories may be present. Furthermore, talk of one's relationship may also make known to others one's sexuality, another traditionally sensitive topic to have aired in public. This may be further compounded by having acquaintances present who may have different understandings of one's personal affairs. We may assume then that raising such personal details in class is ethically somewhat delicate.

A number of formatting features appear to evidence that the teacher acknowledges that this is a sensitive thing to do. Rather than direct the account to the student whose task is underway, he turns to direct his talk to the class in plenum. This has as a result that ST5 is not singled out as having a personal problem with the task. Second, the use of 'kun' (Eng. 'just' or 'only') mitigates for any potential misunderstanding that his own interest in a student's relationship status is anything other than pedagogical, and indeed he proceeds to frame this knowledge as having pedagogical merit, stressing the language learning opportunities of having a Danish (speaking) partner, and how this availability would allow for the teacher to set language learning tasks unavailable in the absence of such a relationship. Finally, we note how following the account, that rather than returning to pursue any further account from ST5, he simply thanks her and moves onto the next student.

Although the earlier analyses focused on student transgressions, participation in the event is not the sole domain of the students. Here we see that it is the teacher - rather than the students - who appears to need to account for his choice of prying into the personal circumstances of the students.

5. Discussion

Participating in social events involves being beholden to interlocking registers of moral conduct.

Whether engaged in a game of chess or a wedding ceremony, an acid house rave or tai chi practice, business lunch or family breakfast, driving or speed-dating, participation rests on some contract of shared social agreement between oneself and co-participating others. Moral evaluations can be triggered on the basis of different moral orders being violated. Tour de France cyclists may on the one hand treat one another's actions as within the bounds or not of mutually agreed moral conduct, subject to negative moral judgment from adversaries, commentators and spectators alike should they display unsportsmanlike behaviour such as bullying, lying, or the use of derogatory language, or ascribed positive moral character for waiting for an opponent who has been involved in an accident. Here, moral behaviour relates to socio-relational conduct, but not with the rules of the race itself.

At the same time, competitors may fall foul of negative moral judgement should they be caught taking performance-enhancing drugs or being engaged in EPO use. Here they are accorded moral rectitude on the basis of how they maintain the orderliness of the formalized competition rules. A transgression such as doping invites explicit collective censure, but may also lead to negative evaluations of the player's moral character.

Language classroom participation is similarly contingent on members producing socially acceptable and appropriate behaviour both in terms of socio-relational matters, and with regard to the normative expectancies for the organization of the social activity. At the same time, classroom interaction rarely comes with explicit sets of rules to which members are able to refer. Indeed, how a classroom is organized is locally contingent, and this may vary from country to country, class to class, across congregations of teachers and students, sizes of groups, and classroom activities. Members are required then to discover the local rules of engagement *in situ*, with in-group membership earned through learning to navigate the norms for participation and engagement. For this reason, even where members are socialized from an early age into classroom orderliness, how the moral order of classroom participation is actually realized is worked out locally (Mortensen, 2008a).

We observe how transgressions of this moral order, or *breaches*, are treated as delicate, sanctionable matters, with the breaching party at risk of public admonishment in front of his or her peers. This has the potential of undermining a member's social status in class, and we note how the strength of the reprimands in the data are frequently mitigated through humour, embodied displays such as smiling and laughter, and often acknowledged with explicit apologies. In this way, the 'transgression sequences' are expanded beyond its most minimal sequence organization and typically include a change in the classroom participation framework to include other participants than just the teacher and the student participant who produced the transgression.

This article supplements earlier research that treats moral order, previously understood as a psychological, internally organized set of values and cultural understandings, as an interaction-implicative object for empirical investigation. By identifying moments where members orient to some transgression in the local order, we are better able to explicate the intricacies of conduct that form the foundation of socially situated organization. Indeed, it provides us with an excellent methodological tool through which we can get at the seen-but-unnoticed practices that Garfinkel describes as the *natural order of things*.

Transcription conventions

The transcription conventions are based on those developed by Gail Jefferson (e.g. 2004). Some are used in modified form for use in the CLAN software tool (MacWhinney & Wagner 2010).

Identifier	FRA :
Pause	(0 . 2)
Overlap markers top	[]
Overlap markers bottom	[]
Intonation: rising	↗
continuing	→
falling	↘
Pitch shift	↑
Smiley voice	☺
Unsure	ʔUnsureʔ
Within word laughter	h
Inbreath	· hhhh
Stress	<u>now</u>
Accelerated speech	Δand youΔ
Gloss/translation	<i>In italics</i>

References

- Aronsson, K., & Cederborg, A.-C. (2012). Family therapy and accountability. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice*, 9(2), 193-212.
- Beattie, C. (2007) *Medieval Single Women: The Politics of Social Classification in Late Medieval England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bergmann, J. R. (1998). Introduction: Morality in discourse. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 331(3-4), 279-294.
- Cromdal, J., & Tholander, M. (2012). Special Issue: Morality in professional practice. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice*, 9(2).
- Deckers, L., & Kizer, P. (1975). Humor and the incongruity hypothesis. *Journal of Psychology*, 90, 215-218.
- Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situations of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*. New York: The Free Press.
- Goodwin, M. H. (2006). *The Hidden Life of Girls*. London: Blackwell.
- Hauser, E. (2009). Turn-taking and Primary Speakership during a Student Discussion. In H. t. Nguyen & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Talk-in-Interaction: Multilingual Perspectives* (pp. 215-244). Honolulu: National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Hazel, S., & Mortensen, K. (in revision). Designedly incomplete objects - materially constituted elicitation tools in language classroom interaction.
- Hazel, S., & Wagner, J. (2015). L2 and L3 integrated learning - lingua franca use in developing an additional language in the classroom. In P. Seedhouse & C. Jenks (Eds.), *International Perspectives on the ELT Classroom Interaction* (pp. 149-167). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hellermann, J., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2010). On the Contingent Nature of Language-Learning-Tasks. *Classroom Discourse*, 1(1), 25-45.
- Heritage, J. (2007). Intersubjectivity and progressivity in references to persons (and places). In T. Stivers & N. J. Enfield (Eds.), *Person Preference in Interaction: Linguistic, Cultural and Social Perspectives* (pp. 255-280). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J., & Raymond, G. (2005). The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Talk-in-Interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1), 15-38.
- Jayyusi, L. (1991). Values and moral judgement: communicative praxis as a moral order. In G. Button (Ed.), *Ethnomethodology and the Human Sciences* (pp. 227-251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1972). Side Sequences. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction* (pp. 294-338). New York: The Free Press.

- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of Transcript Symbols with an Introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation* (pp. 13-31). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly Incomplete Utterances: A Pedagogical Practice for Eliciting Knowledge Displays in Error Correction Sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 35(3), 277-309.
- Kääntä, L. (2010). *Teacher Turn-allocation and Repair Practices in Classroom Interaction: A Multisemiotic Perspective*. Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities, no. 137.
- Liberman, K. (2013). *More Studies in Ethnomenotology*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- MacWhinney, B., & Wagner, J. (2010). Transcribing, searching and data sharing: The CLAN software and the TalkBank data repository. *Gesprächsforschung*, 11, 154-173.
- McHoul, A. (1978). The Organization of Turns at Formal Talk in the Classroom. *Language in Society*, 7, 183-213.
- Mondada, L., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second Language Acquisition as Situated Practice: Task Accomplishment in the French Second Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 501-518.
- Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating Sequential Boundaries and Learning Opportunities: A Case from a Japanese Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88(4), 536-550.
- Mori, J., & Hasegawa, A. (2009). Doing being a foreign language learner in a classroom: Embodiment of cognitive states as social events. *IRAL*, 47, 65-94.
- Mortensen, K. (2008a). *Instructions and Participation in the Second Language Classroom*. University of Southern Denmark, Odense.
- Mortensen, K. (2008b). Selecting Next-Speaker in the Second Language Classroom: How to Find a Willing Next-Speaker in Planned Activities. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 55-79.
- Mortensen, K. (2009). Establishing Reciprocity in Pre-Beginning Position in the Second Language Classroom. *Discourse Processes*, 46(5), 491-515.
- Mortensen, K. (2016). The body as a resource for other-initiation of repair: Cupping the hand behind the ear. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 49(1), 34-57.
doi:10.1080/08351813.2016.1126450
- Mortensen, K., & Hazel, S. (2011). Initiating round robins in the L2 classroom - preliminary observations. *Novitas-Royal*, 5(1), 55-70.
- Mortensen, K., & Hazel, S. (forthc.). Navigating the moral maze: Order and transgression in language classroom participation. In S. Hoffmann, A. Schön, & G. Schwab (Eds.), *Interaktion im Fremdsprachenunterricht. Beiträge aus der empirischen Forschung*. Münster: LIT-Verlag.
- Niemi, K. (2016). *Moral Beings and Becomings - Children's Moral Practices in Classroom Peer Interaction*. (PhD), University of Jyväskylä.
- Niemi, K., & Bateman, A. (2015). Cheaters and Stalkers: Accusations in a classroom. *Discourse Studies*, 17(1), 83-98.
- Paoletti, I., & Fele, G. (2004). Order and Disorder in the Classroom. *Pragmatics*, 14(1), 69-85.
- Pekarek Doehler, S., & Pochon-Berger, E. (2015). The development of L2 interactional competence: evidence from turn-taking organization, sequence organization, repair organization and preference organization. *Usage-based perspectives on second language learning*, 30, 233.

- Pitsch, K. (2006). *Sprache, Körper, Intermediäre Objekte: Zur Multimodalität der Interaktion im bilingualen Geschichtsunterricht*. (PhD), Bielefeld University, Bielefeld.
- Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2012). Somewhere between evil and normal: Traces of morality in a child-protection helpline. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice*, 9(2), 245-262.
- Sacks, H. (1984). On Doing "Being Ordinary". In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis* (pp. 413-429). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation* (G. Jefferson Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Sahlström, F. (1999). *Up the Hill Backwards*. Uppsala: Uppsala Studies in Education.
- Sahlström, F. (2002). The Interactional Organization of Hand Raising in Classroom Interaction. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 37(2), 47-57.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after Next Turn: The Last Structurally Provided Defense of Intersubjectivity in Conversation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(5), 1295-1345.
- Schutz, A. (1967). *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sert, O. (2015). *Social Interaction and L2 Classroom Discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Stivers, T., Mondada, L., & Steensig, J. (Eds.). (2011). *The Morality of Knowledge in Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stivers, T., & Robinson, J. D. (2006). A Preference for Progressivity in Interaction. *Language in Society*, 35, 367-392.
- Stokoe, E. (2003). Mothers, single women and sluts: Gender, morality and membership categorization in neighbourhood disputes. *Feminism and Psychology* 13 (3): 317-344.
- Stokoe, E., & Edwards, D. (2012). Mundane morality: gender, categories and complaints in familial neighbour disputes. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice*, 9(2), 165-192.
- Turner, R. (Ed.) (1974). *Ethnomethodology: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. London: Routledge.

Excerpt 1

FIGURE 1

- 1 SAB: [do you earn a lot of [mon[ey↘
 [All are looking down at their textbooks
 [SAB looks up to TEA
 [CAM looks up to TEA
- 2 TEA: n:o [that's number [four
 [SAB looks back to textbook
 [CAM shakes head slightly, pursing lips into smile
 [AND looks to SAB
 [AND looks to TEA (see Fig.1)
- 3 [(1.0)
 [AND leans back in chair
 [AND looks to SAB, CAM looks down to textbook
- 4 TEA: sabine [did you do [your homework↘
 [CAM looks up to TEA
 [SAB and AND look to TEA
- 5 (0.3) [(0.3)
 [AND and CAM look to SAB
- 6 SAB: HHhh [thuh huh [huh↘
 [SAB looks down at textbook and produces smile
 [AND smiles in SAB's direction
 [SAB establishes mutual gaze with CAM
 [CAM smiles, SAB looks to textbook
- 7 (0.5)
- 8 TEA: hu[h↘
 [AND and CAM look to TEA
- 9 SAB: °huhuh° [.hhh
 [CAM and AND look to SAB
- 10 TEA: no[↘
 [CAM and AND look to TEA
- 11 SAB: [no↘
 [SAB still looking at textbook
- 12 TEA: why not↘
- 13 [(1.1) [(0.5)
 [CAM looks to SAB (see Fig.2)
 [AND looks to SAB
 [SAB shrugs
- 14 SAB: i don't know↘
- 15 (0.5) [(0.5)
 [SAB looks up to TEA
- 16 TEA: [you're [not a good stu[dent
 [TEA raises hand and wags finger at SAB
 [CAM and AND glance at TEA
 [CAM looks down, AND looks to SAB
- 17 SAB: mhm↘
 [SAB shakes head
- 18 TEA: mn↘
 [SAB nods head
- 19 (0.9)
 [SAB looks over at AND, then down to textbook
- 20 TEA: camilla number [six↘
 [AND leans forward and looks to textbook



Fig.1



Fig.2

Excerpt 2

FIGURE 2

- 1 TEA: she does (0.5) exercise↘ (0.2) good→
 2 (2.2)
 3 TEA: [°oka:y↗°
[AND leans forward and positions pen at handout
 4 (1.8)
 5 TEA: Andre number fifteen↘
 6 (1.4)
 7 AND: .hhh pf:::「:::」
 8 CAM: the J plays→(see Fig.1)
 9 (0.8)
 10 CAM: °the-°
 11 (0.3)
 12 TEA: → tɪs [tʏʊr tneɪm [tʌ:nd[re:↘
[CAM opens mouth
[TEA smiles
[CAM purses lips together
[CAM raises left hand to cover mouth
[TEA produces single handclap
[see Fig.2
 13 [(0.5) [(0.3)
[CAM squeezes her eyelids shut
[SAB turns her head to CAM
 14 CAM: → [°so[rry↗°
[CAM withdraws her hand slightly, revealing a smile
[CAM turns her head to SAB, establishing mutual gaze
CAM and SAB both smile (see Fig.3)
 15 TEA: his turn↘ (“yes go on↘”)
 16 (0.4) [(0.4)
[CAM and SAB face forward
 17 AND: basically we have a: (0.4) here
 18 (0.3)
 19 TEA: yeah→



Fig.1



Fig.2



Fig.3

Excerpt 3

FIGURE 3

1 TEA: uhuh do you see people every day↗
2 (1.0)
3 SAB: no↘
4 (0.9)
5 TEA: xx xx
6 (3.7)
7 SAB: moment-uh (2.4) uh:: #calm#↘ huh
8 (3.8)
9 %com: *TEA leans forward*
10 TEA: the activity is very calm↘
11 SAB: for moment-uh (0.4) a little °°xx°°↘
12 TEA: uhuh because of the crisis↘
13 (2.7)
14 SAB: a little bit crise↘
15 dans ce- luxembourg↘ huhuh↗
%gls: *in th- Luxembourg huhuh*
16 TEA: er it's a little crisis or a big crisis↘
17 (7.0)
18 %com: *TEA moves to board and writes 'crisis'*
19 TEA: crisis
20 %com: *TEA underlines last part of word*
21 (0.6)
22 SAB: crisis↘

Excerpt 4

FIGURE 4

- 1 TEA: andre will explain to you andre what's lonely↘
 2 (0.3)
 3 AND: [Hhhh on english↘
 [AND and CAM look to TEA
 4 (0.5) [(0.5)
 [SAB and CAM look to AND
 [TEA starts smiling at AND
 5 TEA: t̩sɔːrɪ↗
 6 AND: on english↘
 7 TEA: t̩n̩ ɔːtɛŋɡ- [of t̩kɔːrs in english↘
 [AND looks down to his textbook (see Fig.1)
 [AND, CAM and SAB smile
 8 ɔːɪt's an english kl̩asː↘
 9 SAB: [huh] huhuhuh
 10 (0.3)
 11 TEA: no in in [l̩ʊzɛmbɔːrɡɪʃ please→
 [see Fig.2
 12 (0.8)
 13 SAB: huh
 14 CAM: no
 15 SAB: nɔː t̩ˈeɪz↘
 16 TEA: [okay] explain ɔːto Camilla in Luxembourgish
 what lonely means↘
 17 (3.4)
 18
 19 TEA: what is lonely↘
 20 she says



Fig.1



Fig.2

Excerpt 5

FIGURE 5

22 TEA: øh:: præsentation (0.8) det skal være ganske kort↗
%gls: *er presentation that has to be really short*
23 (0.5)
24 øh::: j- og jeg starter↗ huh↗
%gls: *er I- and I start huh*
25 (0.3)
26 hvad siger jeg
%gls: *what do I say*
27 jeg hedder lars (0.4) sørensen
%gls: *I'm called Lars Sørensen*
28 (0.7)
29 jeg kommer fra danmark↗
%gls: *I'm from Denmark*
30 heh heh .hhh øh:::↗
31 (1.4)
32 jeg fortæller en præsentation
%gls: *I give a presentation*
33 der jeg også der jeg gerne have (0.6) i fortæller↗
%gls: *the I also want you to give*
34 STU: uh huh↗
35 TEA: så jeg kommer fra danmark↗
%gls: *so I'm from Denmark*
36 jeg er er:: (0.4) syv og fyrre år↗
%gls: *I am er forty seven years old*

Excerpt 6

FIGURE 6

64 LEC: okay i think
65 (0.6) jeg tror det er cirka det ja↗
%gls: *I think that's about it yes*
66 (0.3)
67 UNK: uh-huh≈
68 TEA: ≈øh (0.5) værsgo↗
%gls: *er there you go*

69 (0.2)
70 ST5: okay↗
71 (1.9)
%com ST5 gets up from her chair
72 TEA: yeah let's get up yeah heh heh yeah that's good good
73 ST5: okay
74 (1.3)
75 ST5: øhm ja hedder Oleanna (.) og jeg jeg kommer fra dan- er jeg
76 fra kommer fra Estonia
%gls: *erm I'm called Oleanna and I I come from Den- er I
from come from Estonia*

Excerpt 7

FIGURE 7

91 ST5: jeg jeg je- jeg student på er bachelor degree of a (0.4) science↗
%gls: *I I I- I student at er*
92 (0.4)
93 TEA: mhm↗
94 (0.3)
95 ST5: ja↗ (yeah↗)
96 (0.2)
97 TEA: [hvad hedder det↘
%gls: *what's that called*
%com: [turns gaze to other students
98 (0.4)
99 ST5: natur::≈
%gls: *nature/natural*
100 TEA: ≈ nat (.) bas↗
101 ST5: n- nå nå yeah yeah er nib-bas↘

Excerpt 8

FIGURE 8

107 ST5: internaʃtional basicʃ
108 TEA: lja ja ʃʃjaʃ jeg jeg kan ikke husker er det nib ʃnabʃ nub
%gls: yes yes yes I I can't remember is it nib nab nub
109 ST5: lyesʃ lyeahʃ
110 ST5: sʃåʃ (0.2) jeg er single
%gls: so I am single
111 TEA: ljaʃ
%gls: yes
112 (0.5)
113 TEA: that (0.4) har du er (.) du er single≈
%gls: so I am single
114 ST5: ≈yeah
115 TEA: og du bruger det god danske ord single (0.2) hm
%gls: and you're using the good Danish word 'single' hm
116 (0.4)
117 TEA: this (0.7) this this
118 vi (0.4) vi bruger jo selvfølgelig mange engelske ord i dansʃkʃ
%gls: we we use of course many English words in Danish
119 ST7: lyyeah

Excerpt 9

FIGURE 9

216 TEA: but that's so long so we just say≈
217 ST1: ≈yeʔah ʔ
218 TEA: ʔgloʔbal studies mm yeahʔ yeahʔ
219 (1.0)
220 TEA: are:→ (1.1) uhʔ:::~ʔ ʔ
221 ST2: ʔ°hvor gammel er duʔ°ʔ
%gls: how old are you
222 (0.5)
223 TEA: er #du single eller ʔer duʔ gift du- du er også single≈
%gls: are you *single* or are you *married* you- you are *single* too
#see figure
224 ST1: ʔjaʔ ʔ
%gls: yes
225 ST1: ≈jaʔ≈
226 TEA: ≈jaʔ



Excerpt 10

FIGURE 10

227 (0.4)
 228 TEA: [hvorfør hvorfør vil jeg har jer fortale det
 %gls: *why why I do I want you all telling this*
 %com [turns away from ST1 to the larger body of students
 229 (0.6) #øh:
 %gls: *er*
 #see figure
 230 (0.5)
 231 det er kun fordi hvis der er nogen der er (.) kæreste eller gift med en
 %gls: *it is only because if there is someone who is dating or married to a*
 232 med en dansker (0.3)
 %gls: *to a Dane*
 233 jeg men så det er selvfølgelig er der en mulighed for at lære dansk (0.5)
 %gls: *I but then there is of course there is a possibility to learn*
 235 og er (0.2) det er meget rart (0.2)
 %gls: *and er it is really nice*
 236 det er meget rart for mig ah okay (1.3) then they (0.7)
 %gls: *it is really nice for me er okay*
 237 i can ask you to do something else (0.8) with your spouse (0.4) yeah
 240 (0.9)
 241 ja så (0.2) tak for det ja
 %gls: *yes so thank you for that yes*



ⁱ Despite turns being pre-allocated this type of classroom management only works as a rough grid or guideline for how turns are *supposed* to be organized; how they are actually organized is locally contingent (see Mortensen, 2008b)